



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DANTE AND GUINIZELLI IN CHAUCER'S *Troilus*

And Troilus shal dwellen forth in pine,
 Til Lachesis his thred no lenger twine.
 (T. C., v, 6, 7.)

may be a reminiscence of

E quando Lachesis non ha più lino,
 Solvesi dalla carne.
 (Purg., xxv, 79; cf. also xxi, 25-7.)

Probable echoes of the *Purgatorio* have often been pointed out in *Troilus*.¹

At the beginning of Book III of the *Troilus* Venus is invoked (verse 5),

In gentil hertes ay redy to repaire.

This is almost word for word the opening line in the most celebrated poem by Dante's predecessor Guido Guinizelli, the fifth canzone, on the nature of love (*Scelta di Curiosità*, vol. 185),

Al cor gentil ripara sempre amore.

Chaucer may have been attracted to Guinizelli by the glorifying of him as Dante's "padre mio" in the *Purgatorio* (xxvi, 92, 97 ff.; xi, 97). The reminiscence is not certain. The idea and context are near those of Boccaccio in the *Filostrato* (iii, 74),

figliuola di Giove,
 Benigna donna d'ogni gentil core.

"Gentil herte," "cuer gentil," "gentil core" are a part of the regular fashionable vocabulary of love from the thirteenth century on.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

Stanford University.

BRIEF MENTION

An Anglo-Saxon Reader, edited with notes and glossary. By Alfred J. Wyatt (Cambridge, University Press, 1919). An editor of a new Anglo-Saxon Reader is primarily concerned with the selection of his texts. Professor Wyatt reports serious effort in this matter, namely, "a review of the whole corpus of Anglo-Saxon literature with very distinct aims: to ascertain whether there was any suitable material that had not been drawn upon in earlier works of the same character; to attain to a greater variety of contents than was to be found in some of the books then [when

¹ Skeat, II, 468; *Anglia*, XIII, 184; *Mod. Philol.*, III, 367; XIV, 135-7; Miss Hammond, *Bibl. Manual*, 82-3; Toynbee, *Dante in English Literature*, I, 2, 3. Boccaccio's *Teseide* (x, 32) shows the frequent confusion of Lachesis with Atropos:

Tolgan gl'Iddii, Arcita, amico caro,
 Che Lachesis il fil poco tirato
 Ancora tronchi.

the selection was being made, 'the winter months of 1914-15' in use; to exclude, so far as possible, everything that was not intrinsically interesting; and finally to represent as many sides as we [late Lieutenant Bernard Pitt was then a collaborator in the work] could of the life of our forefathers." It will now be asked, what new material has been selected, material that is not offered in the several Readers in use?

In making a comparison of this Reader with Sweet's (S and S²), with Bright's (B), and with Cook's (C), for the purpose of answering the question asked, it is to be kept in mind that minor details of variation and difference are due to Professor Wyatt's occasional reduction of a whole to merely a part, to his slight extensions or abbreviations of an approved selection, and his avoidance of repetition by a different selection from the same work. Allowance for these features reduces the answer sought to the statement that the new Reader does not offer much that is new. Thus, with C there is an extract from the *Apollonius of Tyre*; an extract from Ælfric's *Colloquy*; Alfred's Preface to the *Boethius*; "The Passing of Chad"; and a selection from the *Judith*.

In like manner there are agreements with S: an extract from the *Laws, Charters* (also S²), *Leechdoms, Gnomie Verses, Riddles, Judith* (also C), *Beowulf* (a short passage also in C), *The Later Genesis*, and *The Dream of the Rood*. From works not represented in the three Readers named, there are extracts from *Solomon and Saturn* (3½ pages); Gregory's *Dialogues* (4 pages); *The Benedictine Rule* (4 pages); the Preface to Alfred's *Blooms* (complete, 1½ pages); a section from the records of the *Chronicle* relating to the Danes (pp. 69-80), which is an extension backward from Sweet's section XVII; *Juliana* (1 page); *St. Guthlac* (2 pages); and the short poems *Deor, The Husband's Message, and Waldere* (together, 5 pages).

Looking now at the selections that make up a large portion of the book, one finds that this is less a supplementary Reader than a reproduction, with minor variations, of "earlier works of the same character." The first division, "Early West Saxon Prose," is begun with *Chron.* 755 and continued with entries relating to the wars of Alfred, and is therefore in essential agreement with S and B. In the second section, from the *Orosius*, a short passage entitled "Central Europe" precedes the "Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan" (S. B); and the section is closed with two passages, "Cyrus" and "Cleopatra." The third division consists of Alfred's Preface to the *Cura Pastoralis* (S. B), a chapter from that work, and Alfred's brief "Conclusion." The extracts from the *Bede* embrace, after a short "Preface," "The Conversion of Edwin" (B), with the disadvantage of the omission of two paragraphs at the beginning and one at the end. Then follow "The Passing of Chad" (noticed above), and *Caedmon* (S. B); and there is added "Bede's Conclusion" (1½ pages). Four pages

from the *Boethius* make up another section. Wulfstan is represented by the *Sermo Lupi*, which in fuller form is S xvi. Finally, as to the prose pieces, there is given *The Harrowing of Hell*, in close agreement with B, but shortened, with disadvantage, by the omission of B 130, 16—131, 12. The pieces in verse that remain to be mentioned contribute further to the points of resemblance and the parts of identity which keep this book in such close relation with the books it has been planned to supplement, according to the "distinct aims" of the editor. In the last division of the book one again finds *The Wanderer*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, *The Battle of Maldon*; and a short passage from *The Phoenix*.

Professor Wyatt very properly indulges in "no silent alterations of the readings of the mss.," but asks for indulgence in "the solitary exception" of printing, "for convenience," always *ond*, "whether the mss. have *ond* or *and*." This is obviously a procedure that is not to be approved. He also states that he has not marked the distinction between "accented" and "unaccented" *ne*. The real point, which is ignored, is the difference in meaning between 'not' and 'nor.' Special attention is, somewhat apologetically, called to the "innovation" of printing as one word certain analytic sequences, such as *ðā ðā*; *ðæs ðe*; *þærtō ēacen*; *mid þī þe*; *swā swā*; *swā þeah*; *swā hwæt swā*; *swā some swā*; *nā þæt ān þæt*, etc., etc. The innovation consists in carrying this practice beyond the restrained limits observed by those editors who have shown some favor to this mistaken view of calligraphy, to say nothing of its grammatical inappropriateness. Professor Wyatt is too keen a grammarian not to perceive that his excess in this matter demands an apology, and here it is: "It is true that *āðeroððe* or *nalæs-ðætānðæt* is not a joy forever"; but this is a feeble excuse for the obscuratation, especially for the beginner, of the laws of sentence-accentuation. He knows 'aswellas' any one how analytic the language was in these matters, and how few forms of the type of 'inasmuch as' and 'insofar as' have in the course of centuries been admitted to the association of *whatsoever*, *nevertheless*, etc.

The preceding observation leads one to notice that the entries in the Glossary are not analyzed in the usual and helpful way. The use of the hyphen to show the composition of the words is a device too instructive to be abandoned. Nor has the editor concerned himself with devices to indicate the derivative formation, or the etymology and cognate relationship of words. These negations constitute a deterrent blank in a Glossary. Moreover, in the Glossary the special regimen of verbs is not indicated except in some instances. This creates a demand for more in the way of syntactical notes than is given. And an occasional note on syntax is not well pointed. Thus *þe . . . him* (*þe ic him*) is brought into connection with Abbott's construction of a passage in *Hen. V* (*Shakespearian Grammar* § 248). More directly to the point would be the observation that the relative particle *þe* (and some-

times *þæt*, which later becomes common) precedes the personal pronoun to make it relative, as *þe hit* = 'which' in *Maldon* 190 (Wyatt, p. 281). With the collocation under discussion compare, for example, *Elene* 162, *þe þis his* = 'whose this,' as correctly noted by Professor Cook. The subject is well set forth in *The English Relative Pronouns, A Critical Essay*, by Ernst Albin Kock (Lund, 1897). The idiom has proved fruitful of surprising contortions in popular parlance, as Professor Wyatt indicates; but it is doubly surprising that the idiom is still overheard also in America. The late Professor A. E. Egge (State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.) reported to me privately a number of instances he had heard and literally recorded. They are of this character: "The woman who lately died *that* they contested *her* will"; "There are two members of the senior class *that their* essays have not been submitted"; "There was a woman at the meeting *that her* husband would not come."

In another note on the *Wanderer* (l. 81), Professor Wyatt has ignored the 'suggestion' offered in *MLN.* XIII, 176 f., and introduces an interpretation that is too fanciful and contradictory to the spirit of the poem for serious consideration. He holds it probable that *fugel* refers to "some mythical bird," supporting his conjecture in this manner: "Craigie points out that there is an example of a bird carrying off a man on one of the Celtic stones at Meigle in E. Perthshire." In connection with the note on XVI, 35, Professor Edgerton's discussion of the dvandva compounds would have proved helpful to the editor (see *Zs. f. vergl. Sprachforschung*, N. F. 43).

The bibliographical summaries in the Notes are usually all that is required, but the interest in a piece is not always well imparted. Thus, for example, the names of Zangemeister and Braune are suppressed in connection with *The Later Genesis*. J. W. B.

The English Poets, edited by Thomas Humphry Ward (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1918), volume five, is a book that links our generation with the time nearly forty years ago when the original work in four volumes appeared. To the fourth volume an appendix was added in 1894, containing selections from Tennyson, Browning, and Arnold. For no very apparent reason that additional material has now been transferred to the beginning of this new volume and takes up precious space that might have been devoted to critical estimates and examples of the work of several poets, all dead since the original work was issued, who, though not in any sense great, have left behind them poems that are worthy of place in this standard and delightful anthology. Robert Buchanan, for the *Ballad of Judas Iscariot*; "Fiona Macleod" for such things as *An Old Tale of Three* and *The Burden of the Tide*; Watts-Dunton for the sonnets in memory of Jowett; John

Payne for the perhaps-flashy but unforgettable *Rime of Redemption* and *Lautrec*; and Lee-Hamilton (the most unaccountable omission) for many of his sonnets. The group of contributors whom Mr. Ward gathered around him in the eighties set a standard of prestige and ability difficult to match; but the editor has been remarkably happy in his selection of new associates. In many cases the man qualified pre-eminently to speak of a certain poet has been chosen: Colvin writes on Stevenson, Gosse on Swinburne, Hardy on William Barnes, Mackail on Morris. Among the most noteworthy essays are those by Mr. Drinkwater introducing various minor writers; in these studies there is a strong grasp of the fundamental laws of poetry and an ability to make use of these lesser but in some ways excellent poets to illustrate by their shortcomings those qualities that make for failure in the art, and by their occasional successes the qualities of precision of outline, of exactness of transcription, of ability to express a well-defined idea in clear and vivid words, that are of the stuff of which great verse is made. Another very satisfying study is that of George Meredith by Mr. John Bailey, in which recognition of the mass of impedimenta that encumbers Meredith's poetical work does not hinder well-reasoned praise of his great tho not ever-present merits. The section devoted to Humorous Verse is treated by Mr. C. L. Graves, who supplies individual introductions to each writer and also a little introduction to the whole section that is a model of compactness and good taste. Canon Beeching's study of R. W. Dixon is inadequate and unsympathetic; an essay upon Dixon with no mention of *Mano* will not do. Even more unsatisfactory is the meagre notice of Francis Thompson by the general editor. Mr. Aldous Huxley deals admirably with Dowson and Middleton, but fails to get to the heart of Davidson's claim to remembrance among the more considerable poets of recent years. Concerning taste it is sometimes useful to dispute; and the taste involved in the selection of parts of this anthology is certainly disputable. The examples from Meredith are particularly meagre and not all of his very best; among De Tabley's poems we do not find the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, or *Napoleon the Great*, or the great *Ode* which begins "Sire of the rising day." The Henley selection, too, is curious; the *Song of the Sword* is not there, nor "Some starlit garden grey with dew," nor "Where forlorn sunsets flare and fade." And what shall be said of a selection from Thompson that includes neither *To the Dead Cardinal* nor *In No Strange Land*? What of representing Davidson by but two poems while Stephen Phillips has eight, Lang nine, and Stevenson actually twenty-six? But such errors in proportion are bound to occur in a work done in collaboration by a large number of men; they do not seriously interfere with the merits of a volume that is already, because of its relation to those which preceded it, a classic in its way.

S. C. C.

Gertrud Wacker, *Über das Verhältnis von Dialekt und Schriftsprache im Altfranzösischen, Beiträge zur Gesch. der Rom. Spr. u. Lit.*, XI, 1916. The means for determining the dialect of Old French texts are few and uncertain. That many of them must be used with even greater caution than has been customary in the past is apparent from this study by Gertrud Wacker. The orthodox method of procedure in editing an Old French text has been to collect all the examples of unusual forms essential to its structure, track each to the district with which it seems to be most often identified, and then assign the text under consideration to some hypothetical region adjoining as many of these districts as possible. That such border lands, especially the frontier between the Ile de France and Picardy, have somehow been disconcertingly fertile in the production of poets was pointed out by Morf in Herrig's *Archiv*, cxxxii, pp. 256 ff. Miss Wacker, by questioning the validity of many of the criteria used in localizing Old French texts, succeeds in undermining the reputation of these mythical marches.

Taking some fifty-two works whose origins can be determined with a fair degree of accuracy, she tabulates the examples in each of them of certain forms generally held to be criteria for judging the dialect of Old French texts, and at the same time she states in every case the number of examples of the opposite phenomenon (*i. e.* of the normal form) found in the text considered. She shows, for instance, that various phenomena of Picard origin—*iee>ie*, the pronouns *mi*, *ti*, *vo*, *no*, such forms of the infinitive as *veir*, *seir*, and the rimes *ance : anche*, *esse : esche*, etc.—not only are absent from texts reliably classed as Picard, but are present in works known to have emanated from other districts. On the other hand, it is apparent from her table that altho a confusion of the rimes in *ē* and *ā* is characteristic of Ile de France writers, poets definitely assigned to Picardy also confuse them. She concludes that, while various dialects were developing in different parts of France, typical forms of some of them made their way, for political and literary reasons, into the written language of the time, and that this written language, which existed in France from the first half of the twelfth century, in its beginnings possessed many so-called Norman characteristics to which during its second period, dating from the thirteenth century, a number of Picard traits were gradually added. She contends therefore that the presence or absence of certain dialectal peculiarities in the language of a given writer can furnish no reliable data for determining the provenance of that writer.

The study is clearly written, its materials are logically presented, and its conclusions constitute a significant contribution to a problem that has long puzzled students of Old French texts. G. F.
